

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 15, 2010. Claims 14 to 17 are pending in the application of which Claims 14, 16 and 17 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated under U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0021905 (Holmstead). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present claims concern an information processing apparatus that caches and manages image data downloaded from a server device for use in processing subsequent print jobs. According to one aspect of the invention, image data, downloaded as image data to be printed from the server device to the information processing apparatus and transmitted to the printer, is cached in a cache memory. After caching, a cache list of the image data cached in cache memory is stored. A first set of image data to be printed is then designated among image data stored in the server device. A print list of the image data to be printed is also stored. Upon storing the print list, the cache list and the print list are compared. Image data which is in the print list, but not in the cache list, is downloaded from the server device and transmitted to the printer. In addition, image data, which is in both the cache list and the print list, is identified and transmitted from the cache memory to the printer. Furthermore, a second set of image data which is in the cache list, but not in the print list, is deleted from the cache memory based on when the second set of image data

is designated, so as to prevent the image data which was not successively selected as image data to be printed from remaining in the cache memory.

Turning to specific claim language, independent Claim 14 is directed to an information processing apparatus communicating with a server device and a printer. The information processing apparatus includes: a designation unit configured to designate a first plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation; a downloading unit configured to download the designated image data from the server device; a cache memory configured to cache the downloaded image data; a print processing unit configured to read the cached image data from the cache memory and execute print processing of the read image data; and a deletion unit configured to delete from the cache memory, based on when the designation unit designates a second plurality of image data, the image data, of the designated first plurality of image data, which is not successively designated by the designation unit as image data to be printed and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by the designation unit, wherein the downloading unit downloads the designated second plurality of image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

Applicant submits that the cited references, namely Holmstead and Seseck, whether considered alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claims 14, 16 and 17. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a deletion unit configured to delete from the cache memory, based on when said designation unit designates a second plurality of image data, the image data of the designated first plurality

of image data, which is not successively designated by said designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by said designation unit, wherein said downloading unit downloads the designated second plurality of image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

In contrast to the present claims, Holmstead discloses a system that stores print job elements in a local memory in order to reduce the amount of time used to assemble the elements in a printer for processing a print job. If a print job requires certain elements, the system searches the local memory for those elements. If the elements are not found, the elements are retrieved from an external device, such as a print server, and stored in the local memory. If the elements are found in the local memory already, the elements are reused. Furthermore, Holmstead discloses that elements may be stored in different memory areas and used by different customers. In an example described in paragraph [0051] of Holmstead, information stored by customer A is overwritten every thirty days because customer A prints completely different materials every thirty days. However, information for customer B is stored indefinitely as customer B accesses the same information as customer B sends very similar print jobs referencing the same elements over an extended period of time. However, neither scenario discloses active deletion of a first plurality of image data when a second plurality of image data is designated. Instead, Holmstead disclose that a control system stores a print job element in local memory for a specified period of time as indicated in a “retain field.” See Holmstead, paragraph [0058].

In addition, Seseck merely discloses caching of print-ready files of web pages, where an existing print-ready file of a web page is replaced by an updated print-ready file of the same web page whenever that web page has been modified. However, Seseck fails to disclose anything that, when combined with Holmstead, would have resulted in the feature of a deletion unit configured to delete from the cache memory, based on when said designation unit designates a second plurality of image data, the image data of the designated first plurality of image data, which is not successively designated by said designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by said designation unit, wherein said downloading unit downloads the designated second plurality of image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

In light of the deficiencies of Holmstead and Seseck as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 14 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent claims 16 and 17 are directed to a method and a computer-readable non-transitory storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 16 and 17 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Any necessary fees are being paid concurrently herewith. The Director is hereby authorized to credit any fee overpayment, or charge any fee underpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Registration No. 42,419
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200